

A

# DISCOURSE

OF THE <sup>4372. Dec. 4</sup>

<sup>1-10</sup>  
Satisfaction

OF

# CHRIST,

FROM

ROM. VIII. i, ii, iii, iv.

WHEREIN

The SENTIMENTS of Dr. BURY  
concerning that Subject, are Stated  
and Consider'd.

---

EXON:

Printed by S. F. for the Author, and Sold by T.  
Butter, and at the Printing-House. 1703.

DISCOURSE

OF THE

Sanctification

OF

CHRIST

FROM



THE SENTIMENTS OF DR. BERNARD  
concerning that subject are stated  
and collected.

Printed by J. E. for the Author, and Sold by T.  
Baker, and at the Printing-Office, 1803.

A  
DISCOURSE  
OF THE  
Satisfaction  
OF  
CHRIST.

**R**OMANS 8. 1, 2, 3, 4. *There is now* [in the Gospel Dispensation] *no Condemnation* [to Eternal Death, for so *κατάκριμα* signifies here] *to them who* [by Believing] *are in Christ Jesus,* [to wit, to them] *who walk not* [whose Conversation, or Course of Life, is not] *after the Flesh,* [to do the Works of the Flesh] *but after the Spirit* [to bring forth the Fruit of the Spirit; to such is no Condemnation, for such are not under the Law, but under Grace.] *For the Law of the Spirit of Life,* [the Gospel, or New Testament, which is the Ministration of the Spirit, and of Righteousness, 2 Cor. 3. 8, 9.] *hath made me* [he Instances in himself, as to Redemption and Deliverance; because he was the Example and Instance in the Complaint,

*Rom. 7. 14. The Law of the Spirit of Life [the Law of Faith] hath made me Free from the Law of Sin and Death. [that is, from the Law that was given by Moses, and is contradistinguish'd to the Grace, and Truth, which came by Jesus Christ, John 1. 17. To wit, the Law of the Old Testament, called, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9. the Ministration of Death, and of Condemnation]* So that I am no longer under the Law, the Law hath no more to say to me, nor I to it; I am not under the Law, but under Grace: And therefore, there is no Condemnation unto me, I am Acquitted, Absolv'd, Discharg'd, Ay, Sanctified, as well as Justified.

**BUT** How doth this Appear? This he sheweth *V. 3. For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the Flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh, and for Sin condemned Sin in the Flesh. Thus our Translators. But the Greek is thus: Τὸ ὁ ἀδυνατὸν τῆ Νομοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἠδένει διὰ τὴ σαρκὸς, ὁ Θεὸς τὸ αὐτὸ τῆ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν, ὁμοιωμάτι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατένευε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, (for what was impossible for the Law to do in that it was weak through the Flesh) God sending his own Son in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin Offering, and of a Sacrifice for Sin, condemned Sin in the Flesh.*

**TO** clear the Meaning of this Text, I will shew, I. What that is the Law of *Moses* could not do, and why it could not. II. What it is that **GOD** himself hath done, and how he did it.

**THAT** which the Law of *Moses* could not do [the *Impossibile Legis*] must be understood in Two Respects, 1. With respect to Sanctification, and 2. In respect of Justification.

**IN** respect of Sanctification, the Law could not extinguish, or subdue Sin; but far from that, it was the Occasion that Sin encreased, and acquired new Strength and Vigour. Like as a Water-Course, or  
Current,



Current, that by an Insufficient Dam, and Restraint upon it, rages and breaks out more furiously, *Rom. 7. 5. When we were in the Flesh, the Motions of Sin, which were by the Law, did work [the more] in our Members to bring forth Fruit unto Death. V. 8, 9. Sin [Original Sin, or the Pravity and Corruption of our Nature] taking Occasion by the Commandment, wrought in me all manner of Concupiscence. For without the Law Sin was dead; [did not stir so much, as after the Commandment came, and that I made some Conscience to Obey it.] For I was [once] Alive, [I tho't well of my self, that I was in a good Condition,] whilst I was without [any Conscience of] the Law: But when the Law came [home unto my Conscience,] then Sin revived, [Sin stirred the more, and was more provoked,] and I [through Consciousness of Guilt, and by the Condemnation of the Law] Died [and looked on my self as a lost Man;] For Sin taking Occasion by the Commandment, deceived me, [while I understood the Commandment only in the Letter, without penetrating to the Spiritual Meaning. Thus Sin not only raged, but put upon, and deceived me,] and by it [the Commandment] slew me; [I found my self a Man Dead in Law, as being Guilty, and under the Condemnation of the Law to Eternal Death:] Which brings me to the Second thing, which the Law could not do, and that is*

THE Law could not *Justify* the Sinner, or Propitiate and Atone GOD for Sin. As it could not Absolve or take away Sin, as to the Power or Strength of it; so neither could it abolish, or take Sin away, as to the Guilt or Punishment. On the contrary, the Law accused, bound over, condemned the Sinner, and gave unto Sin all the Authority, Strength and Power, that it hath to indite or prosecute the Sinner, *The Strength of Sin is the Law.*

IN both these Respects the Law was Weak and Infirm; and as what is Weak and Infirm, but not absolutely Dead or Unactive, the Law did what it could in *both*; it endeavour'd to Prevent and Extinguish Sin, by *Forbidding* it, and threatening it; and it also endeavour'd to Attone, Pacify and Propitiate GOD, and make Peace and Reconciliation between Him and the Sinner, by its Sacrifices and Offerings; But in *both* to small or no Effect; it attempted to do *both*, but could perform neither, in that it was *weak through the Flesh*. What Flesh? To Answer this, It must be consider'd, that as the Law was impotent, and infirm in Two respects; In respect of Sanctification, and also of Justification; So answerably there is a Twofold *Flesh*, through which the Law was *weak* in both respects; it was weak through *our* Humane Flesh, in respect of *Sanctification*, and weak through *its own* Flesh, in respect of *Justification*.

1. IT could not *Sanctify*, by reason of *our* Flesh, that Corruption of Nature, which as a Law in our Members did make a perpetual, strong and vigorous Opposition against it, *Rom. 7. 5. For when we were in the Flesh, the Motions of Sin, which were by the Law, [there was a Struggle it seems] did work in our Members to bring forth Fruit unto Death. V. 14. The Law [the Moral Law of Ten Commandments] is Spiritual, but I am Carnal, sold under Sin. And V. 18. In me (that is in my Flesh) dwelleth no good thing, &c. How to perform that which is good, I find not. And V. 23. I see another Law in my Members, warring against the Law of my Mind, [with which I would serve the Law of God] and bringing me into Captivity [so that I am not my own Man, but a Slave] to the Law of Sin which is in my Members.*

2. IT could not *Justify*, in that it was weak thro' *its own* Flesh; that is, it was weak thro' the *Carnality*

lity and Fleshliness of its *Institutions*; the Means and Remedies appointed by the Law for Expiation of Sin, and Reconciliation with GOD, were all but *meer Flesh, Carnal, Unspiritual*, [they were but *Δικαιώματα Σαρκός*,] as the *Blood of Bulls, and of Goats, and the sprinkling of the Ashes of an Heifer*; and these things, and such as these, could never satisfy, please and content GOD, who is the Living GOD, and a Spirit, or be the Matter of a Service that could effectually *Purify the Conscience*: Hebr. 9. 9, 10. Which was a Figure for the time then present, in which were offered both Gifts, and Sacrifices, that could not make him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience, which stood only in *Mears, and Drinks, and divers washings and carnal Ordinances, impos'd on them until the time of Reformation*, Hebr. 7. 16, 18, 19. Who is made not after the Law of a carnal Commandment, but after the Power of an endless Life. For there is verily a disanulling of the Commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better Hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God. Heb. 10. 4. *Ἀδύνατον ὅτι*, For it is impossible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins. And this being the same word as is used Rom. 8. 3. when the Apostle speaks of what the Law could not do, it is evident that as there, so here, he means it could not take away sins, by making Satisfaction to Divine Justice; or (because the word Satisfaction is no where found in the Holy Scripture) to do what is Equivalent, namely to expiate for Sin, and cleanse the Conscience of the Sinner.

I have shew'd what the Law, or Old Covenant, could not do; but before I proceed to shew what GOD hath done thro' CHRIST in the Gospel, or New Covenant, I must obviate an Objection or Demand,



which lies in the way, which is, Whether there was no Salvation, or taking away of Sin under the Law ? But that *all* Men, during the Legal Dispensation, lay under the Sentence of Condemnation ? There is no *Condemnation* now, but was there nothing but *Condemnation* then ? I answer. There was Salvation then, *even under the Law*, but it was not *by the Law* ; It was by *Faith in the Promise* made to *Abraham*, which Promise was *Gospel* : The Law indeed was *added* to the Promise ; but that Addition did not, could not *Disanul* the Promise ; and therefore *Moses*, tho' he describes [only] the Righteousness which is of the Law, *that the Man who doth these things shall live by them* ; yet he mentions also the Righteousness, which is of Faith, *Rom. 10. 5, 6*. Believers *then* were saved, as well as Believers *now*. And this the Apostle intimates when *V. 11.* of the same Chap. he quotes *Isa. 28. 16.* *Whosoever Believeth on him shall not be ashamed.*

TO return then ; What was impossible for the Law to do, being weak thro' the Flesh, that GOD hath done by *Jesus Christ*, who thro' the *Eternal Spirit* is able to save unto the uttermost all those who come unto GOD thro' Him : And this is the second Point in the Text, which I proposed to be handled, to wit, What it is that GOD himself hath done, and how he did it, *God sending his own Son in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, and of a Sacrifice for sin, hath condemned sin in the Flesh.*

Here are Three Things observable, all which must be consider'd with some Exactness : That GOD sent his own Son, That he sent him in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, And that [thus] He condemned SIN in the Flesh.

GOD sent his own Son Jesus Christ. If Jesus Christ had come without being sent, whatever he had *done* or *suffer'd*, would have Availed us little ; because, without



without Consent and Approbation of the Law-giver, no Dispensation, no Relaxation of the Law could be admitted. The Father must agree, that what the Son doth, shall be accepted in our Behalf, and be Allowed by him as on our Account, or it would not signify to our Advantage; Christ could not be our Surety, if he was not taken to be so. But GOD accepted Him; Ay, Proposed the Undertaking to Him, and encourag'd him therein; *GOD sent his own Son.*

BUT how did GOD send him? And to what purpose? *He sent him in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, and of a Sacrifice for sin*; [which were the Appointments of the Law, and so he sent him to Accomplish what the Law (by them) could not effect,] when Sacrifices and Offerings would not do, GOD sent his own Son in the Flesh, (that is) he prepared him a Body, and so sent him. Christ was first made of a Woman, and then made under the Law, *Gal. 4. 4, 5. But when the Fulness of the Time was come, GOD sent forth his Son made of a Woman, made under the Law, to Redeem them that were under the Law, Heb. 10. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.* It is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away sins; wherefore, when he [the Son] cometh into the World, he saith, *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not, but a Body hast thou prepared Me. In Burnt Offerings, and Sacrifices for sin [such as were Offer'd according to the Law] thou hadst no pleasure [they did not satisfy or content thee;]* Then said I [Christ the Son of GOD said] *Lo, I come, in the Volume of the Book, [ἐν κεφαλῇ BIBAIΟΥ, in the Head or Beginning of the Book; that is (says St. Hierome) in Gen. 3. 15.] It is written of Me (not by way of Promise to Adam or Eve, but of Prophecy, it is hinted in the Sentence or Denunciation upon the Serpent) I come to do thy Will, O GOD.* And what was GOD's Will, but this? That his Son should come in-  
to

to the World, to be a Sin-Offering, and a Sacrifice for Sin. *He sent him in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, and of a Sacrifice for sin, to undo the Works of Satan,* 1 John 3. 8.

BUT what is it to be sent in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, and of a Sacrifice for Sin, but to be sent in the Flesh to be a Sin-Offering, and a Sacrifice for Sin? For as Christ is said, *Phil. 2. 7. to be made in the Likeness of Men, (ἐν ὁμοιώματι Ἀνθρώπων)* when he was made a Man; so when he is said here to be sent ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς Ἀμαρτίας, καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας, *in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, and of a Sacrifice for sin,* it must be understood, that he was sent in Flesh to be a Sin-Offering, and a Sacrifice for Sin; that is, sent to make his Soul (or Life in the Flesh) to be an Offering, and Sacrifice for Sin.

HERE it may be demanded, why I leave the usual Version of the Text, [*God sending his own Son in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, and for Sin condemned Sin in the Flesh*] to render, as I do, [*God sending his Son in the Likeness of the Flesh of a Sin-Offering, &c. condemned Sin, &c.*] My Reason is, that in the usual Version it is difficult to make a commodious Grammatical Sense of it, and difficult also to shew how the Son of God, who himself knew no Sin, should be sent in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, when Sin is the only Exception in his Likeness to us, *He was like unto us in all things, Sin only excepted.* But what did most prevail with me to embrace the Version I give, is, that in this Version the Sense is more congruous, not only to the Analogy of the Text it self, but to that of other Scriptures; and that the Version is *Literal*, and according to the acknowledged Use of the words, Ἀμαρτία, & περὶ Ἀμαρτίας, in other Scriptures.

THIS is manifest, and will not be much disputed, as to the Term Ἀμαρτία, or Sin; For what is rendered

dred by our Translators, *Lev. 4. 21. It is a Sin-Offering for the Congregation*, is in the *Septuagint*, or *Greek*, Ἀμαρτία Συναγωγῆς ἐστίν, it is the Ἀμαρτία, it is the *SIN of the Congregation*. The like is in *V. 29. & 34.* and in other Texts. And in this sense of the word Ἀμαρτία, or *Sin*, Christ, who knew no Sin, is *2 Cor. 5. 21.* said to be *made of God to be Sin*; that is, a *SIN-OFFERING* for us, καὶ ὃς μὴ γνόντα Ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἈΜΑΡΤΙΑΝ ἐποίησεν.

And for *πρὸς Ἀμαρτίας*, which is the other word, and which I render a *Sacrifice for Sin*, I find it used in the same sense, and (which makes it more remarkable) in conjunction too (as it is here) with a word Equivalent to Ἀμαρτία, *Hebr. 10. 6.* In *Burnt Offerings* [Ὀλοκαυτώματα] and the Ὀλοκαύτωμα was the same with the Ἀμαρτία, as appears from *Lev. 4. 21.* in *Burnt Offerings*, and *Sacrifices for SIN* [καὶ πρὸς Ἀμαρτίας] *thou hast no pleasure*; where (it must be noted that) our Translators themselves have rendered *πρὸς Ἀμαρτίας*, as I do here, *Sacrifices for Sin*. So in *Heb. 10. 8.* above when he said *SACRIFICE* and *OFFERING*, and (which he makes as Equivalent to these two) *Burnt Offerings*, and *Offerings for Sin* [Ὀλοκαυτώματα, καὶ πρὸς Ἀμαρτίας] *thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein*: Which whole Quotation is taken from *Psal. 40. 6.* according to the *Greek Version*. So agreeable is the Version I have made to the Use of the words, and to the *Analogy of Faith*.

THUS GOD sent his own Son to be a Sacrifice for Sin to make Attonement and Propitiation, and so to take away Sin: Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the Sins of the World, *John 1. 29.* which could not be effected but by *Attoning* and *Propitiating* C. D. To *Attone* him, is to *Appease* his Anger, and thereby to make him *Favourable*, and this is to *Propitiate*, *Rom. 3. 25.* Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation.



IN every Sin and Transgression there is *ὀργισμός*, a Contempt of God; that is, a making little or no Account of him, or of his Authority; and that in Two respects; in respect of his Command, and also in respect of his Threats; in the former his Authority, in the latter his Power is contemned. Every Sinner in effect says, He doth not care or regard what GOD bids him; and also that he fears not what he can do to him: And both the one and the other is to *Despise*; and to *Despise*, is the greatest Provocation and Dishonour can be done an Infinite and Almighty Power, especially being done to his Face, (as all is here) for this is to *Affront* him.

NOW *Anger* is a Sense or Resentment of *Indignity*, Contempt or Affront offer'd, joyn'd with a Desire of *Revenge*; than which (*Revenge*) nothing is more natural, or more Just, both as it is a *Repulsion* of Injury, and as a *Reparation* for it: For so *Anger* is not *Passion*, but Reason. Whole *Nature* speaks this, and every *Man* in his own Breast hath something that confirms it. As nothing *Provokes* more than Scorn, or Contempt, so nothing is thought more Just, or is more Natural than to demand *satisfaction*; and nothing is *satisfaction* (even Honourable) but what *Repairs*, as much as may be, what is past; and also *secures* for the Future [I have done amiss; and I will do so no more] without this no Man thinks himself *satisfied*, even in Private Injury or Contempt, but more is required in Publick.

NOW GOD is Just, as well as Good; and as it is in his Nature to know and understand himself, and what belongs to him; so it is but *Justice* to himself to see he has it: For the Judge of all the Earth to do his Creatures Right, and not to do it to himself, were to deny himself, which he cannot do. I add that for GOD to suffer Indignity, Affront and Contempt, and



and that in the Face of all the World, to pass with Impunity, or without sufficient and *Publick* Reparation, were to be accessory to his own Dishonour, and to the Breach and Transgression of his own Law. It would induce a Belief in Men, he did not hate Sin, or hate it (as he does) *mortally*; or if he do, that he *could not* Punish it, but was such an one as themselves.

Wherefore, to do himself *Justice*, and make the Sinner know himself, and also to know him, that *He is of purer Eyes than to behold Iniquity, and not to punish it*, tho' GOD had a Goodness for Men, and really did pity and compassionate their Misery, which they had brought upon themselves; yet he *would not* Pardon them, or be Reconciled with them, but upon terms of Honourable *Reparation* for what was past, and of *security* for the future; *Nahum. 1. 2, 3.* That as his Law had threatned *Death* to the Sinner, so *Die the Sinner must* in himself, or in his *Representative* Jesus Christ, [*Die per se, aut per Alium*] and even the *Redeemed* Sinner, tho' he do not Die himself Eternally, yet he must *Temporally*; Ay, and Sin it self must Die too, and Die *in the Flesh*, that *the Righteousness of the Law may be fulfilled in those that Live.* And is not all this (and without all this is no Salvation) to be call'd Satisfaction? If not, what is? *Rom. 8. 10. If Christ be in you, the Body is dead* [you must Die *Temporally*, and as to the Life of the Body] *because of sin, but the Spirit is Life* [there is a Resurrection] *because of Righteousness.* *Rom. 1. 18. The Wrath of God is revealed from Heaven,* [in the Gospel, that assures us that the Son of God was sent from Heaven, to be a Sin-Offering, and that God *spared not him*, tho' his own Son, when he took upon him our Sins; but delivered him over to Death: so great a Detestation he declared *publickly* to all the World against, and *Anger* for] *all Ungodliness and Unrighteousness of Men.* Private Satisfaction

faction by *Particular Men*, by their Repentance and Reformation, could not make sufficient *Reparation*; for as Sin came by *one*, in whom all were, and Death by Sin; so *Reparation* must be made by *one* too, in whom all the Redeemed are. And thus, *What the Law could not do in that it was weak through the Flesh, God [as Judge of all] sending his own Son in the Flesh, in the Likeness of a Sin-Offering, and a Sacrifice for sin, condemned Sin in the Flesh, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit.*

**T O** Condemn Sin, is to pass a Sentence or Judgment of Death upon Sin; so that tho' there is no Condemnation to the Sinner, if he be in *Christ*, because *Christ*, as his Sin-Offering, and Sacrifice for Sin, hath made Attonement for *him*, and so all his Sins are pardoned, and taken away; yet sin it self must not escape, **GOD** hath condemned *sin* to Death, *in the Flesh*. The Sacrifices that were *Flesh* died; and even *Christ* died, as a Sacrifice, *in the Flesh*: Sin must die, and the *Flesh* in which sin inhabited and dwelt must die too. In fine; Sin must not live in the *Flesh*, even of the *Redeemed*: The *Redeemed* must be always slaying it, killing it by a daily Mortification thereof. *Rom. 3. 13. If ye live after the Flesh, ye shall die [Eternally]; but if through the Spirit ye do mortify the Deeds of the Body [for Sin must die] ye shall live. [Ye cannot live, if Sin do not die.]*

**THIS** shows for what End (it was that) **GOD** condemned Sin in the *Flesh*. It was that the *Righteousness of the Law* might be fulfilled in us; **GOD** was resolv'd, that entire satisfaction should be given to the Law, and that not only Sin, or the Transgression of the Law should be punish'd in the Sinner, but that its *Righteousness*, which is Entire and Compleat Obedience, or what is Equivalent, should be fulfilled in

in us; That as the Law [or GOD thro' it] had receiv'd the *Affront* by us; so it [and GOD thro' it] might have its *Reparation* in us. But how is the Law fulfilled in us? It is fulfilled by the *Regenerate*, by their Conformity to GOD in Holiness, so far as they are *Regenerate*; and that they *walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit*. For what is Born of the Spirit, is Spirit, *Joh. 3. 6.* And *John 3. 9. Whosoever is Born of God, doth not commit sin.* In short, it was fulfilled actually, and to all Intents and Purposes in *Christ*, when he was in our *Flesh*. *Matth. 3. 15. Suffer it to be so now: For thus it becometh us to fulfill all Righteousness.*

THUS I have shew'd from the Holy Scriptures, which only can direct us in our present Search, what is the true Way, wherein it hath pleased GOD to compass the Salvation of Fallen Man. That he did it by his *own Son*, in a Way most Honourable to Himself, as well as Best for Man: A Way in which *Mercy* and *Justice* kiss each other, tho' of the Two, *Mercy* in this Business rejoyceth over Judgment.

THE Occasion was this: Dr. BURY, a very Learned Man, who not long ago had written *the Naked Gospel*; of late, in a Book intituled, *The Rational Deist satisfied by a Just Account of the Gospel*, doth instead of *the Naked Gospel*, as he call'd it before, now make it quite *Another Gospel* [*Ἐτερον ἐκ ἐστὶν Ἄλλο.*]

HE acknowledges a *Messia*, a *Person Anointed*, (as *Prophets, Priests, and Kings* had been) and stiled *Prince*, to signify (he says) he was Above All other *Anointed*, being both *Lord*, and *Christ*, and more than a *meer Man*. He also acknowledges, That *Christ suffered*, and that it became Him to Suffer: But says, He is not so bold (wherein truly I think him wise, and concur with him) as to confine God's Wisdom (which is Infinite and Unconfined) so as to say, God had no other way [than by Christ's Suffering] to satisfy his own Justice, and save Mankind. For this indeed were great

Ar-



*Arrogance* and *Presumption*. But then withal, he ought to have consider'd, and have own'd, That *this* is however the Way which GOD hath taken to save Mankind (namely, by the Death and Passion of *Christ*) for so it is said, *Thus it behoved Christ to suffer*; that is, GOD in his Infinite Wisdom had so laid and contriv'd the Plot of Man's Salvation, that *this* must be Effected by giving him SATISFACTION for his Injur'd Honour, which is done by *Christ's* Sufferings; *Christ* himself must suffer as a *Sin-Offering*, that he might become a Saviour of Men from Sin, *Luke. 24. 26. 44.*

IT is agreed by Dr. BURY, that GOD hath Satisfaction, but *not agreed* in what *that* Satisfaction consists. He tells us, That GOD might satisfy himself in Mankind, either by *destroying* it, as he did in *Noah's* Time, when he satisfied his *Anger*, and promis'd to do so no more; or by *renewing* it, as he doth *now* in *Christ*, by satisfying his Love, without Impeachment to his *Purity, Justice, or any other of his Perfections.*

HERE it must be observ'd, before I proceed further, that 'tis *not* promised by GOD, he will not *satisfy his Anger* (if this must be the Expression) any more upon Sinners: For *this* he hath done since in innumerable Instances (of which the History of the *Old Testament*, and indeed all History is full) but that he will no more do it *that same way*, by a General Flood, involving both Man and Beast; as is evident *Gen. 9. 11. I will establish my Covenant with you, neither shall all Flesh be cut off any more by the Waters of the Flood, neither shall there any more be a Flood to destroy the Earth.* But to return to Dr. BURY.

Having secur'd the World from all Fear of GOD's taking his Satisfaction of it by way of *Anger*, he goes on in the next place to shew, how GOD hath his Satisfaction *now* by the way of *Love* [without any mixture of *Anger*, not the least Air of this] in *Christ*.

But



But this methinks is a little contrary to the Apostle, *Rom. i. 18.* who says there, *That the Wrath of God is [now] revealed from Heaven [in the Gospel] against all Ungodliness, and Unrighteousness of Men.* And how revealed in the Gospel, but in that it holds forth that GOD sent his own Son to be a *Sin-Offering*, and gave him over to Death for our Sins without *sparing* him, *Rom. 8. 32.* Ay, the Apostle *Peter*, *Ep. 2. Ch. 2. V. 4, 5.* argues, that the Destruction of bold, daring Sinners under the Gospel, is most certain, from this, that *God spared not the Angels that Fell*, and that *he spared not the Old World in the Time of Noah*: So far was he then from having his Anger satisfied against Sinners. However, Let us see how Dr. BURY sets out his *Hypothesis*.

Mankind (*says he*) was Created by GOD in his own Likeness, above all other Visible Creatures; and Mankind alone defaced that Image: All other Created Natures preserved their Original Perfection; the only Flaw in the World was this Apostate, who denied GOD the Satisfaction to see one Good in the whole kind. To give him *that* Satisfaction there must be a *Man* Able and Willing to supply the Defect, and a *Man* Responsible for the whole Kind; he must be a *Man*, and a *Man* that must *Merit*. And such a *Man* was *Christ*; whom it behoved to Suffer, that He might give the Father the Satisfaction to see in Humane Nature all the Perfection, and all the Obedience that he could desire. It was thus that *Christ* died *for our sins*, because our Sins were the Occasional, and our Pardon the Final Cause. And thus he expiated; not as Expiation imports an *Imputation of Guilt*; but rather some Valuable Service, or other Recompence that may countervail in a contrary kind. A Surety must be Responsible, a Redeemer Rich, a Ransom Valuable, a Sacrifice Unblemished, a Propitiation

Acceptable, a Mediator Friendly, &c. This is the Sum of his *Hypothesis*, which I have Fairly and Fully Represented.

I will not reflect upon his way of Speaking, as he doth, on Dr. *Sherlock's*, and yet is guilty of the same Fault, if it be a Fault to speak of the *Nature*, as if it were a *Person*, since it is become a Popular Fashionable Way: I understand his Meaning when he says, God Created Mankind in his own Likeness, and Mankind defaced that Image, and became Apostate, to be that he created *Adam* and *Eve* (in whom only the Humane Nature or Kind existed at that Time) after his own Image, which Image they defaced, and turning *Apostates*, Corrupted the whole Kind: So that GOD had not the Satisfaction to see his true undefaced Image again in any one Man before *Christ* came. This I take to be his Meaning, and beg his Pardon, if I mistake it.

BUT if he mean *this* by God's having Satisfaction, Satisfaction is no other than God's Welpleasedness, such as he is said to have in the Creatures, when 'tis said of him, as to his Works in *several*, he saw them to be *Good*; and as to them all in general, and taken together, he saw them to be *very Good*, that is, he was pleased with them, he liked what he had done. Now this Satisfaction indeed God wanted in Mankind after the Apostacy of *Adam*, because after *this* he found not in *Men*, or indeed in any one Man, that Perfect Image and Likeness in which he had Created *Adam*, and which pleased him so well then; instead Now of seeing All was Good, he saw too much that was very Bad. But he had his *first* Satisfaction, and more too than *that* in *Christ*, and in Humane Nature, as it was in *Christ*; for *Christ* as he was a Man, and in all things like unto other Men (Sin only excepted): So he was the Son of God, and in him the Fulness of the Godhead dwelled

*dwelled Bodily, and of him the Father pronounced, This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

THAT God hath this Satisfaction in Christ, will on all hands be easily agreed. But there is *Another* Satisfaction to be given unto God by Christ, as he is the Saviour and Redeemer of Men, and that is a Satisfaction made to God by way of Reparation for the Indignity and Dishonour done unto him by Man's Sin, He must *bear* the Punishment of our Iniquity, as I have set out before, in order to Establish Peace between God and Men : But of this Satisfaction not one word in this Learned Man's *Hypothesis*, but quite the contrary, and that *Expiation* is not by Imputation of Guilt, but by an Equivalent, or an Overballancing Service.

BUT if Expiation was not by Imputation of Guilt, why must the Priest *put his hand* upon the Head of the Bullock, his *Sin-Offering* ? And why the Elders of the Congregation *lay their hands* upon the Head of the Bullock, that was the *Sin-Offering* for the Congregation ? And what means the *Confession* over the *Scapè Goat*, after *that* for the Lord had been killed ? To me it is certain, that Christ, the very *Truth* of all the *Types*, did as our Redeemer and Saviour, make Peace for us, and pleased God, not only by an Absolute and Entire Obedience to the Law, whereby the Righteousness of the Law was *fulfilled* in our Nature, but in that he *supererrogated*, and was Obedient to his Father in a Matter, which the Law required Not, but a Matter acceptable to God ; namely, that he should make his *Soul an Offering for our sin*, and take the *Chastisement of our Peace* upon him ; which indeed was the *only Tribute* that he did, or could Pay with a Protestation, that it was not due ; For *this* the Law required not of an Innocent Righteous Person, and therefore was the only thing, in which he could Merit.



Christ must not be Offer'd against his Will ; had he been wholly *Passive*, no Merit could have been in the Offering ; he must be Priest and Sacrifice both, to Merit by his Offering.

IT must be acknowledg'd that the Death and Passion of our Lord Christ was a most *Meritorious* Act of Obedience ; but it was Meritorious, not only as an Act of Obedience, but that Act of Obedience was a *Satisfaction to Justice* : Indeed for Christ to suffer purely because he was Commanded to do it, would have been an Act of great Obedience in him, but for God to command it only as a Proof of Obedience without any other Consideration, or valuable Motive, seems not so consistent with the true *Idea* Mankind hath of him. *God is Love and Goodness*, and delighteth not in the Death even of a Sinner : How then can he be thought to command his Son into Torments, only to have him show his Obedience ? Would not this be to give the Character to God that some *Barbarous Princes* are Infamous for in Story, who have made such Arbitrary and Horrible Experiments of the Affection of their Slaves ? Is it not more reasonable to believe, as being more Honourable for God, and Equally Meritorious in Christ, and a greater Obligation upon us to Christ, that when *Burnt Offerings*, and *Sacrifices for sin*, according to the Law, could not give his Father Satisfaction for *Mens sins*, (that) God should send his Son, and his Son cheerfully Obey, and come as our Surety to be not a Sinner, but an *Offering* for Sin in our stead, to give him that Satisfaction which the *Legal Sacrifices* could not. This is the Scriptural Representation of the Matter, *Heb. 10. 1, 2, &c. to the 10.* And thus Christ, as our Surety, paid our Debt of Punishment.

Dr. BURY owns indeed, That Christ did take upon him to Represent all Mankind ; but says, *It was as God made us, not as we had corrupted our selves ;* and that,



as our Surety, he paid the Debt of Perfect Obedience, which (he says) made Punishment Undue. And in truth, if the Debt of Perfect Obedience had been always paid, that Debt of Punishment had never been due: But that Debt of Perfect Obedience being not paid by us, there arose upon our Disobedience another Debt to the Law, which was a Debt of Punishment of Death: And is a Debt that must also be paid by our Surety, in order to his making a compleat Satisfaction: Now this Debt of Punishment is paid by Christ in the suffering of death for us, wherein he represented Man, as having Corrupted himself: For he who knew no sin, was made sin for us [that is first,] that we might be made the Righteousness of God through him, [that is consequent upon the former.] And as Justice will not exact Punishment where it is not due: So it would not be Justice, if it did not exact where it is due. It must be observ'd, that Christ is said to die for the Ungodly, and that while we were yet Sinners Christ died for us, Rom. 5. 8, 9, 10. It is true, it was God's Will and Pleasure he should Die, and so his dying was an Act of Obedience: But it is also true, he died for us, for our Sins, and so his Death was a Payment or Satisfaction for our Debt. And thus, as by one Offence [for so δὴ ἐνὸς παραπτώματος] should be rendered. As by once eating the forbidden Fruit Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation [of Death,] even so by one Act of Obedience δὴ ἐνὸς δικαιώματος [one Act of Righteousness in suffering Death, Phil. 2. 8.] The free Gift came upon all to justification of life.

But here Dr. BURY will tell us, We are too hasty, if we believe the Lamb the Representative of the Votary, and that as such it bore his Guilt, and paid his Punishment: Were it so (says he) not the Spotless, but the Blemished; not innocent Lambs, but devouring Wolves, had been proper. A very ill-grounded Inference! And that sounds, as if Dr. BURY imagin'd,

gin'd, that *Christ* to be an Offering for Sin, must himself have been a Sinner; or that he had never read *Heb. 9. 28.* where it is said, *That Christ was once Offered to bear the sins of many, and that he shall be seen a second time without sin, of those that expect him to salvation.* He was in himself an Unspotted Lamb; but as he bore our Sins, a Spotted Goat; in Himself sinless, but made Sin for us.

Dr. *BURY* further Infers from what he had last said, That the Right (misprinted I suppose for the Rite) of Sacrificing, (therefore) imported the same Honour to God, as all those *Eastern Nations* still paid their Kings, whom they never approach without a Present; we have heard the Apostle give a better Reason from *Point of Honour*; *It became God to make the Captain of our Salvation Perfect through Sufferings.* The Captain, saith he, not the Criminal.

AS if *Christ* did Offer himself unto the Father, only as an *Honorary Present*: Which I should think would not have been affirmed by Dr. *BURY*, if he had minded, that the Scriptures distinguish between *Oblations* and *CRUENTOUS Sacrifices*; and that the Sacrifice that *Christ* made, was of his *Blood*; and such *Presents* were not used to be made by the *Eastern*, or any other Nations to their Kings, as *Honorary Presents*. The Account is much clearer, and more congruous to the *Analogy* of Scripture that is given of this Matter in *Heb. 9. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12.* compared with *V. 22, 23, 28.*

FOR the *Point of Honour* mentioned by Dr. *BURY*, that it became GOD to make the Captain of our Salvation perfect thro' Sufferings; it is certainly true, it became GOD indeed to see he had Honourable Satisfaction made to Him, by Him who would undertake to be our Leader to a State of Salvation; so that the Meaning is, That *Christ*, by suffering Death for us, and thereby giving Satisfaction unto GOD for our

our Sins, was Qualified to be a Perfect *High-Priest* toward GOD by way of *Intercession* for us ; which, without shedding his Blood and suffering Death, he could not have been, as not having paid the Price of our Redemption, and Contented GOD ; nor having wherewithal, as our *High-Priest*, to enter into Heaven, and there appear for us ; For whereon should He ground his *Intercession*, if he made it without carrying his Blood with him, *Heb. 9. 12. By his own Blood he entered in once, &c. 1 Joh. 2. 1, 2. We have an Advocate with the Father, and he is the Propitiation for our sins.* This is the Way in which things are Represented in the Scriptures after the Manner of Men ; and as GOD is pleased to Represent it, we must take it.

BUT Dr. BURY tells us, That those who take *Christ's* Sufferings for a Punishment, [ he must mean a Vicarious Punishment, or to be instead of our Punishment, ] and argue from the Definition of *Justice*, which is to give every Man his *Due*, do hastily Infer Due Punishment to the Guilty, as well as Due Reward to the Good ; That the *Anglicism* deludes, and the *Latine* will undeceive ; for in that Tongue, and in Reality, it is not the Governour, but the Offender, which giveth Punishment.

HERE the Doctor himself is too hasty ( to use his own Expression ) if he think it can be Inferred from the *Latine*, or the common Use of the Phrase for Punishment in any other Language, that the Offender, and not the Governour, doth give Punishment : For *Dare Panas* ( on which he grounds it ) is really a *Latinism*, and deceives him. For if he bethink himself, that *Pena* did signify the *Loss* that must be paid by the Loser of any *Game*, and that from paying the *Loss* ( which is Grievous to the Loser ) the word became used to signify the Suffering of any Punishment, it



gin'd, that *Christ* to be an Offering for Sin, must himself have been a Sinner ; or that he had never read *Heb. 9. 28.* where it is said, *That Christ was once Offered to bear the sins of many, and that he shall be seen a second time without sin, of those that expect him to salvation.* He was in himself an Unspotted Lamb ; but as he bore our Sins, a Spotted Goat ; in Himself sinless, but made Sin for us.

Dr. *BURY* further Infers from what he had last said, That the Right (misprinted I suppose for the Rite) of Sacrificing, (therefore) imported the same Honour to God, as all those Eastern Nations still paid their Kings, whom they never approach without a Present ; we have heard the Apostle give a better Reason from Point of Honour ; *It became God to make the Captain of our Salvation Perfect through Sufferings. The Captain,* saith he, *not the Criminal.*

AS if *Christ* did Offer himself unto the Father, only as an *Honorary Present* : Which I should think would not have been affirmed by Dr. *BURY*, if he had minded, that the Scriptures distinguish between *Oblations* and *CRUENTOUS Sacrifices* ; and that the Sacrifice that *Christ* made, was of his Blood ; and such Presents were not used to be made by the Eastern, or any other Nations to their Kings, as *Honorary Presents*. The Account is much clearer, and more congruous to the Analogy of Scripture that is given of this Matter in *Heb. 9. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12.* compared with *V. 22, 23, 28.*

FOR the Point of Honour mentioned by Dr. *BURY*, that it became GOD to make the Captain of our Salvation perfect thro' Sufferings ; it is certainly true, it became GOD indeed to see he had Honourable Satisfaction made to Him, by Him who would undertake to be our Leader to a State of Salvation ; so that the Meaning is, That *Christ*, by suffering Death for us, and thereby giving Satisfaction unto GOD for our

our Sins, was Qualified to be a Perfect *High-Priest* toward GOD by way of *Intercession* for us; which, without shedding his Blood and suffering Death, he could not have been, as not having paid the Price of our Redemption, and *Contented* GOD; nor having wherewithal, as our *High-Priest*, to enter into Heaven, and there appear for us; For whereon should He ground his *Intercession*, if he made it without carrying his Blood with him, *Heb. 9. 12. By his own Blood he entred in once, &c. 1 Joh. 2. 1, 2. We have an Advocate with the Father, and he is the Propitiation for our sins.* This is the Way in which things are Represented in the Scriptures after the Manner of Men; and as GOD is pleased to Represent it, we must take it.

BUT Dr. BURY tells us, That those who take *Christ's* Sufferings for a Punishment, [ he must mean a Vicarious Punishment, or to be instead of our Punishment, ] and argue from the Definition of *Justice*, which is to give every Man his *Due*, do *hastily* Infer Due Punishment to the Guilty, as well as Due Reward to the Good; That the *Anglicism* deludes, and the *Latine* will undeceive; for in that Tongue, and in Reality, it is not the Governour, but the Offender, which *giveth Punishment*.

HERE the *Doctor* himself is too *hasty* (to use his own Expression) if he think it can be Inferred from the *Latine*, or the common Use of the Phrase for Punishment in any other Language, that the Offender, and not the Governour, doth give Punishment: For *Dare Panas* (on which he grounds it) is really a *Latinism*, and deceives him. For if he bethink himself, that *Pana* did signify the *Loss* that must be paid by the Loser of any *Game*, and that from paying the *Loss* (which is Grievous to the Loser) the word became used to signify the Suffering of any Punishment, it

it will be evident that *Dare Penas* is the same with *Laere Penas*, and consequently that *Dare Penas* is no otherwise a *Giving Punishment*, than as *Suffering Punishment* is paying a Debt. This for the *Word*.

AND for the *Reality*; It certainly belongs to the Governour to Punish as well as to Reward, *More Majorum Supplicium sumendum est*, saith *Cato*. The Law makes Punishment a *Debt* to be paid by the Offender; and the Offender pays that *Debt* by submitting to suffer the Punishment: But in regard that few will submit to suffer the Punishment (and perhaps are not obliged to do so, if the Law be not also a *Pact* and Agreement) unless they are compelled; the Governour is provided with *Executioners* to take the Debt, by inflicting the *Due Punishment*, which would be *Felony* in our Law for a *Criminal* to give himself. But as these are Matters not worth the Insisting upon, so I gladly dismiss them. Only I will add, I do not think that a Governour is obliged to be so *severe* as always to Punish every Transgression or Violation of the Law, without any Remission or Relaxation. But I do think that if he *never* Punish, or not *sufficiently* to Preserve his own Authority, or contain the Subjects in their due Obedience, the Laws will soon become *Scare-crows*, and the Governour himself but as the *Logg* in the Fable.

I have ended with Dr. *BURY* as to this Subject: And think it Time Now to Appeal to the Christian World, to Judge between Him and those he Opposes; and also to Judge of the Two *Hypotheses* proposed, which is the more agreeable to the Gospel, and to the Common Sentiments of Mankind. For my self, I am willing to stand or fall by the Impartial Judgment of Understanding Judicious Christians, as becomes a Person who professes, as I do, an Absolute Adherence to the Truth, so far as I see it, and not to Parties, or Sects.

F I N I S.



with  
no  
Pu-  
the  
more  
The  
Of-  
it-  
that  
er-  
lso  
d;  
ke  
ich  
ve  
the  
ill  
to  
on  
or  
sh,  
or  
he  
er-  
et:  
an  
oo-  
oo-  
nd  
lf,  
g-  
e-  
te  
ot